UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,553	04/02/2001	Kirk Johnson	2762.2002-002	9887

21005 7590 08/08/2007

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER	
PATEL, JAY P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/824,553	JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay P. Patel	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-11,13-18,20-22,24-29,31,33 and 35-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *26,27,37 and 38* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-11,13,15,17,18,20-22,24,28,29,31,33 and 35* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *14, 16, 25 and 36* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the RCE/remarks/amendment filed 4/5/2007.

2. Claims 2-11, 13-18, 20-22, 24-29, 31, 33 and 35-38 are pending.

3. Claims 2-11, 13, 15, 17, 18 20-22, 24, 28-29, 31, 33 and 35 are rejected.

4. Claims 26-27 and 37-38 are allowed.

5. Claims 14, 16, 25 and 36 are objected to.

6. Claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 30, 32 and 34 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (i.e. a computer program product).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-11, 13, 15, 17, 20-22, 24 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6650641 B1) further in view of Jindal et al. (U.S. Patent 6092178) further in view of Bhatia et al. (US Patent 6563824 B1).

3. In regards to claims 13 and 24, Albert discloses in figure 2 forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220. Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The forwarding agent and the service manager are obvious over a translating device and the virtual machine is obvious over a server. The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over initiating communications, from a server behind the translating device, which effect the network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose monitoring the communication beyond the translation device to infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device

to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claims 13 and 24, neither Albert nor Jindal teach comparing the apparent message source address with the address in the translated address set. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 7. Figure 7, illustrates a method carried out after a packet has passed a LAN modem, where the source address is disguised using NAT. Step 705 is a search is made in the NAT table for a public source port number that matches that of the packet's.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by

Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

In regards to claims 2, 3 and 20 Albert discloses in figure 7, a wildcard affinity diagram. The wildcard affinity diagram includes a source IP address.

In regards to claim 4, the source IP address included in the wildcard affinity diagram also is obvious over a unique identification number in the message.

In regards to claim 5, Albert discloses in figure 13, a flowchart illustrating a process implemented on a forwarding agent for executing NAT as directed by a service manger. In the affinity step 1306, the forwarding agent checks the action specified in the affinity. If the action specifies that the packet be to be forwarded to the service manger, then control is transferred to step 1308 and the packet is sent to a service manger. If the action specifies that the packet is to undergo Nat then control is transferred to step 1310 where the source IP address is changed (see figure 13, and column 29, lines 56-67 and column 30, line 1). The action that specifies whether the packet is to go NAT or forwarded to the service manager, is obvious over distinguishing between communications affected by and not affected by network address translation.

In regards to claims 6, 15, 21 and 22, Albert in combination with Jindal and Bhatia teaches all the limitations of parent claim 13 and 24. Neither Albert nor Jindal teach comparing the apparent message source address with the address in the translated address set and assessing whether the source address is behind a know translation device. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figures 7

and 8. Figure 7, illustrates a method carried out after a packet has passed a LAN modem, where the source address is disguised using NAT. Step 705 is a search is made in the NAT table for a public source port number that matches that of the packet's. In figure 8, at step 810, a packet is transmitted to the proper server/workstation if a match is found in the NAT table.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

In regards to claim 7, Albert discloses that to specify a single host the wildcard affinity include an IP address with a specific net mask. To specify the range of hosts (i.e. from 1.1.1.0 to 1.1.1.255), the wildcard affinity would include IP address of 1.1.1.0 with a net mask of 255.255.255.0 (see column 17, lines 47-54). The range of host with the IP address, anticipate, assessing a range of network addresses behind the translating device.

In regards to claim 8, from figure 2A, it is evident that the host whether they are clients or servers, are connected to the service managers and forward agents; therefore, the disclosure used with regards to claim 7, is also applicable to claim 8.

In regards to claims 9 and 10, figure 2A discloses a plurality of clients, forwarding agents, service mangers and servers. The servers communicate with network through

forwarding agents (see column 6, lines 46-53). The forward agents have knowledge of the network and since the servers communicate to the network via the forwarding agents, it is anticipated that passive and active clients are distinguished and that messages are directed from the passive to the active client.

In regards to clam 11, the service manager and the forwarding agent, respectively contain processors 252 and 272. Both processors are respectively connected to a network interface. The network interface in the forwarding agent is used to send and receive packets to and from other devices on the network (see column 9, lines 61-64). The network interface in the service manager allows the service manager to directly forward packets into the network from which it is providing a service (see column 10, lines 23-25). The respective processors and their connection to the network interface and its functions anticipate from a processor beyond the translating device, causing a message to a passive client to be redirected to an active client, the active client responsive communicating with the processor beyond the translating device.

4. In regards to claim 17 Albert discloses in figure 2 forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220. Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The forwarding agent and the service manager are obvious over a translating device and the virtual machine is obvious over a server. The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over initiating communications, from a server behind the translating device, which effect the network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose monitoring the communication beyond the translation device to infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client

and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claim 17 neither Albert nor Jindal teach commanding a new client to contact a known client behind the same network address translation device. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 8. In figure 8, at step 810, a packet is transmitted to the proper workstation behind the server if a match is found in the NAT table. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

5. In regards to claims 28 and 29, forwarding agent and the service manager respectively contain memories 254 and 274 connected to the respective processors (see figures 2B and 2C). The memories are obvious over a computer usable medium for storing data.

In further regards to claim 28 and claim 30, Albert discloses in figure 2, forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220.

Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over receiving communications from a network device effecting network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This

disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claims 28 and 29 neither Albert nor Jindal teach storing a database of translated address set in memory and comparing the address with the apparent address. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 7. Figure 7, illustrates a method carried out after a packet has passed a LAN modem, where the source address is disguised using NAT. Step 705 is a search is made in the NAT table for a public source port number that matches that of the packet's.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

6. In regards to claim 31, Albert discloses in figure 2 forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220. Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The forwarding agent and the service manager are obvious over a translating device and the virtual machine is obvious over a server. The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over initiating communications, from a server behind the translating device, which effect the network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose monitoring the communication beyond the translation device to infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device

to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claim 31 and dependent claim 33 neither Albert nor Jindal teach comparing the apparent message source address with the address in the translated address set and having the source address in the translated address set. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 7. Figure 7, illustrates a method carried out after a packet has passed a LAN modem, where the source address is disguised using NAT. Step 705 is a search is made in the NAT table for a public source port number that matches that of the packet's.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the

Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

7. In regards to claim 35, forwarding agent and the service manager respectively contain memories 254 and 274 connected to the respective processors (see figures 2B and 2C). The memories are obvious over a computer usable medium for storing data.

In further regards to claim 28 and claim 30, Albert discloses in figure 2, forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220. Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over receiving communications from a network device effecting network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within

a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claim 35 neither Albert nor Jindal teach storing a database of translated address set in memory and comparing the address with the apparent address. Bhatia however teaches the above-mentioned limitation in figure 7. Figure 7,

illustrates a method carried out after a packet has passed a LAN modem, where the source address is disguised using NAT. Step 705 is a search is made in the NAT table for a public source port number that matches that of the packet's.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the address comparison taught by Bhatia into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to allow for secure routing even when the actual addresses are replaced by apparent addresses.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6650641 B1) further in view of Jindal et al. (U.S. Patent 6092178) further in view of Boden et al. (US Patent 6717949 B1).

9. In regards to claim 18, Albert discloses in figure 2 forwarding agents 231, 232, service mangers 241, 242 and a group of servers 220. Furthermore, figure 11 illustrates how a forwarding agent and a service manager implement NAT between a client and a virtual machine (see figure 11 and column 28, lines 1-19). The forwarding agent and the service manager are obvious over a translating device and the virtual machine is obvious over a server. The implementation of the NAT by the forwarding agent and a service manger is obvious over initiating communications, from a server behind the translating device, which effect the network address translation.

In further regards, Albert fails to particularly disclose monitoring the communication beyond the translation device to infer partitioning of servers behind the translation device into equivalent sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation. Jindal teaches the above-mentioned limitations in figure 2. Jindal describes that a load-balancing application may be exposed to requesting clients through a virtual server name; clients contact a DNS server to determine a server offering desired application. Jindal also mentions that it is well known in the art the DNS servers typically satisfy client request by resolving the virtual server name to an identity (i.e., a network address) of one network server within a pool of suitable servers (see column 7, lines 1-9). Jindal also mentions the a preferred server may be identified by the client on a regular or periodic basis, and may be the same as or different from the one previously identified; thus, client requests are distributed among the participating servers and the application is load-balanced (see column 6, lines 36-43). This disclosure is obvious over monitoring the communications beyond a translating device to infer partitioning of servers. Jindal also discloses that based on the selected policy, each status object 200 may measure the response time of its associated server (110, 112, 114) or the application instance operating on the server to implement load balancing policies (See figure 2 and column 8, lines 30-46). This disclosure is obvious over partitioning servers behind the translating device into equivalence sets relative to the network topology induced by the network address translation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Network address translation (NAT) between a client

and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The advantage of doing so would be properly load balance client request based on NAT and load balancing policies. The motivation to combine comes from Jindal, which would be to enhance the functionality and flexibility of a network name service such as DNS (Domain Name Service).

In further regards to claim 18, neither Albert nor Jindal teach occasionally refreshing a partition list. Boden however, teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Boden discloses HIDE statements for a NAT procedure when a new datagram is received (thus refreshing takes place) and address translation needs to be performed. An example is shown in table 1 in column 3 where a server group behind a device with a public address is hidden.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the command statements as taught by Boden into the Network address translation (NAT) between a client and a virtual machine disclosed by Albert with the load balancing disclosed by Jindal. The motivation to combine would be to selectively masquerade individual source addresses into various public addresses.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 26-27 and 37-38 are allowed.

11. In regards to claims 26 and 37, the cited prior art fails to teach either individually or in combination, providing an actual network address when a packet isn't affected by Network address translation.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13, 17-18, 24, 28-29, 31 and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Claims 14, 16, 25 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay P. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3086. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 am - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JPP 7/31/07

Jay P. Patel
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2616

HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600